

University of Rhode Island DigitalCommons@URI

Reauthorization: Institute for Museum Services
(IMS) (1990)

Education: National Endowment for the Arts and
Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996)

1990

Reauthorization: Institute for Museum Services (IMS) (1990): Correspondence 03

Daphne Wood Murray

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_74

Recommended Citation

Wood Murray, Daphne, "Reauthorization: Institute for Museum Services (IMS) (1990): Correspondence 03" (1990).
Reauthorization: Institute for Museum Services (IMS) (1990). Paper 15.
http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_74/15

This Correspondence is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Reauthorization: Institute for Museum Services (IMS) (1990) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.



Institute of Museum Services

Change in Professional Services Program
A Federal agency serving the nation's museums

Office of the Director • 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W. • Washington, D.C. 20506 • (202) 786-0536

June 12, 1990

The Honorable Claiborne Pell
SR-335 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510-3901

Dear Senator Pell:

It has come to my attention that a proposal has been raised to continue to limit statutory eligibility for Institute of Museum Service's cooperative agreements to professional museum organizations, under the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act, USC 20, Chapter 26, Section 965(b)(1).

The Administration's proposal requests deleting this limitation to allow the flexibility to consider proposing policy changes through regulatory channels at sometime in the future. Such change would allow consideration of a wider range of legitimate, competitive proposals. This would increase the number and quality of proposals to this program and enhance the potential benefit to the museum community and the public.

Several entities that are not currently eligible that could develop proposals which we would like to consider are: state museums (which sometimes act as the state's primary service organization), universities, non-profit research firms, individuals and other museums. Some examples of the types of projects we may anticipate are conservation training, research to improve the public's interaction with museum exhibits, professional training to further enhance standards of professional museum operations, disaster preparedness models, etc.

I would be happy to discuss this further with you directly and Mamie Bittner, the IMS Congressional Liaison, is available to provide any additional information you require.

Sincerely,

Daphne Wood Murray

Daphne Wood Murray